R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 018 867 EA 001 273

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF ORGANIZATIONAL DECISION-MAKING IN HIGH SCHOOLS.

BY- PATTERSON, WADE N.

PUB DATE 9 FEB 68

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$0.92 21P.

DESCRIPTORS- *DECISION MAKING, *ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE, *HIGH SCHOOLS, POWER STRUCTURE, SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENTS, SCHOOL DISTRICTS, PRINCIPALS, QUESTIONNAIRES, SOCIAL SYSTEMS, CHICAGO,

THIS STUDY ATTEMPTS TO RELATE THE VARIABLES OF POWER AND INFLUENCE TO OPERATIONAL DECISIONMAKING IN SELECTED HIGH SCHOOLS. TWO HIGH SCHOOLS IN A WEST COAST CITY ARE EXAMINED (1) TO DETERMINE THE RELATIVE DEGREE OF DECISIONMAKING INFLUENCE OF INDIVIDUAL PARTICIPANTS AND GROUPS, (2) TO INVESTIGATE THE ROLE OF PERSONS WITHOUT FORMAL (OFFICIAL) POSITIONS OF AUTHORITY IN DECISIONMAKING, AND (3) TO DETERMINE WHETHER REPUTATIONS FOR INFLUENCE CORRESPOND TO FORMAL ORGANIZATIONAL POSITIONS. THE SCHOOLS WERE CHOSEN ON THE BASIS OF SIMILARITY OF FORMAL ORGANIZATION, WRITTEN ADMINISTRATIVE POLICIES, SCHOOL PROGRAMS, STUDENT ENROLLMENT, NUMBER OF FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE PERSONNEL, LOCATION IN A COMMON SCHOOL DISTRICT, AND IDENTIFICATION OF SIMILAR ISSUES FOR ANALYSIS. THE REPUTATIONAL TECHNIQUE AND THE ISSUE ANALYSIS TECHNIQUE WERE USED AS METHODOLOGICAL APPROACHES. THE STUDY SOUGHT TO ANSWER QUESTIONS IN THE FOLLOWING AREAS, UTILIZING ALL RELEVANT DATA AND GENERALIZATIONS PREVIOUSLY GATHERED FOR THE PROJECT--(1) THE CIRCUMSTANCES UNDER WHICH REPUTATIONS FOR POWER AND INFLUENCE CORRESPOND TO FORMAL ORGANIZATIONAL POSITION, (2) MODIFICATION OF POWER AND INFLUENCE IN DECISIONMAKING BY PERSONS IN THE SCHOOL WHO DO NOT HOLD FORMAL ORGANIZATIONAL STATUS OR POSITIONS, (3) THE CIRCUMSTANCES UNDER WHICH PERSONS WITHOUT FORMAL POSITIONS OF AUTHORITY IN THE SCHOOLS EXERCISE INFLUENCE IN DECISIONMAKING, (4) MEANS BY WHICH EXTRA-ORGANIZATIONAL POWER AND INFLUENCE ARE MANIFESTED, AND (5) PRESENCE OF A CONSISTENCY BETWEEN PERSONAL REPUTATION FOR POWER AND INFLUENCE AND PERCEIVED EXERCISE OF POWER AND INFLUENCE CONCERNING DECISIONS. THIS PAPER WAS PRESENTED AT THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE AMERICAN EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH ASSOCIATION (CHICAGO, ILLINOIS, FEBRUARY 8-10, 1968). (HM)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF ORGANIZATIONAL DECISION-MAKING IN HIGH SCHOOLS*

by Wade N. Patterson

Introduction

The making of many types of decisions is a major facet of the dynamic life of a social system or of an organization. These decisions are made primarily as the result of relationships and interactions among participating individuals and groups.

Limitations and structures, on a formal (official) basis and on an informal (unofficial) basis, are established in all organizations and social systems. Some of these limitations are relatively permanent, but many are constantly changing and producing states of disequilibrium. Among the major variables which affect these changes and decisions are the differential power and influence possessed by various persons and groups.

The empirical research to be reported here is based on the notion that public high schools in this country are social systems which possess the usual elements of formal organization, which in turn contain an informal organization based on human relationships and interaction. Herein, the varying degrees of power and influence possessed by participants can be exerted in numerous directions. It may be exerted or maintained individually or collectively; it may be applied to specific decisions or to general areas; it may be part of the formal or the informal structure of decision-making in the social system or organization.

---

* Prepared for presentation at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, February 9, 1968. The author is currently Assistant Superintendent, Grants Pass Public Schools, Oregon. The research reported was conducted while he was a Research Assistant, Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, University of Oregon.

ED018867

EA 001 243

In many studies, persons possessing this influence have often been identified with formal organizational positions. However, numerous exceptions have been found wherein persons with relatively lesser or no formal position in an organization are influential in determining the course of decisions.

This study attempts to relate the variables of power and influence to operational decision-making in selected high schools. Three major objectives will be to examine decision-making in two schools for the following purposes:

1. To determine the relative degree of decision-making influence of individual participants and groups.
2. To examine the role of persons without formal (official) positions of authority in decision-making.
3. To determine whether reputations for influence correspond to formal (official) organizational positions.

The following major research questions serve as a point of departure for the study:

1. Under what circumstances do reputations for power and influence correspond to formal organizational position?
2. How are power and influence in decision-making modified or affected by persons in the school who do not hold formal organizational status or positions?
3. Under what circumstances will persons without formal positions of authority in the schools exercise influence in the making of decisions?
4. How will extra-organizational power and influence be manifested?
5. Is there a consistency between personal reputation for power and influence and perceived exercise of power and influence concerning decisions?

The two basic methodological approaches employed to examine the social systems are popularly known as the reputational technique and the issue analysis technique.

Data Collection

Two schools, designated "Central High School" and "East High School," located in the same school district in a west coast city, were selected for the study. Criteria used in the selection were similarity of formal organization, written administrative policies, and school programs and offerings; similarity in number of students enrolled and number of faculty and administrative personnel; a minimum of 1,000 enrolled students; location in a common school district; and identification of similar issues for analysis.

The term, "similar issues for analysis," refers to general areas of previous decisions made in each of the schools. These areas were identified by staff members of the two schools in the manner described below. The issues were narrow enough for specific study, yet broad enough to include curricular and departmental lines with regard to potential involvement of persons associated with the school. The issues were of a nature that would afford opportunity for involvement by every teacher, administrator, supervisor, and classified staff member in the school, as well as persons outside the school.

The following procedures were used to complete the research. In both of the selected schools, a written questionnaire identifying issues (see Appendix A) was administered to a sample of all faculty, administrative, and other certified staff personnel who had been present in the school for at least two years. The questionnaires, given to this group of respondents at each school, asked only for identification of five major issues, problems, changes, or innovations resulting in a decision which the respondent considered to be of greatest school-wide importance since the start of the specified year.

The data from these questionnaires were compiled by adding the total number of times an issue was identified by the respondents in a given school. Two lists of issues, one for each school, were made, and the issues ranked according to the frequency of identification. The lists were compared to determine those issues in similar areas of concern that had been most frequently mentioned in both schools. At this point, three issues, each in an area similar to that of the other high school, were selected for analysis in each school.

For the second major step, a written reputational questionnaire (see Appendix B) was given in both schools to the same initial respondent group which answered the issue analysis questionnaire. Through these reputational questionnaires, personal identification and classification information were obtained from each respondent. The questionnaires also enabled respondents to identify the individuals in the school who were perceived to have the most general decision-making power and influence. A ranking of these general influentials from the first one through the tenth was requested, as well as identification as to position and reasons for their influence.

The reputational data thus collected were tabulated to determine a list of people who, for the purposes of the study, could be called "potential influentials." The criteria for selection of "potential influentials" were either being chosen in any position by the initial group of respondents on the reputational questionnaire by more than one person, or being chosen as one of the top three influentials by any single respondent.

Although this is not a rigid scheme for selecting "potential influentials," it does provide a means of ordering data and is a method which is generally used in studies on influence. Complete objectivity is not yet possible in examining operational decisions of persons who collectively comprise various social systems.

After considering all available alternatives for ranking "potential influentials" and "influentials," the investigator chose in each case the most appropriate means for identifying and ordering persons and groups.

For the third major step of the data gathering, the "potential influentials" for each school were given a written questionnaire (see Appendix C) asking them to identify general group or organizational influence. In addition, all of these "potential influentials" who had not previously responded to the general personal influence questionnaire (Appendix B) were asked to do so.

The general group or organizational influence questionnaire (Appendix C) called for some personal identification and classification information from each respondent as well as for identification of the groups or organizations in the school who were perceived to hold the most power and influence in general decision-making. Request was made of a ranking of these influential groups or organizations from first in importance through tenth, to be supplemented by a statement of reasons for their influence.

Also, as another part of the third major step, the "potential influentials" in both schools were given another written questionnaire (see Appendix D) asking them to determine influential individuals and organizations or groups relating to specific issue areas (which were identified in the first written questionnaire administered to the original respondent populations). This questionnaire asks for a first through tenth ranking of persons and groups or organizations that are perceived to be influential in three specific areas.

The results of the last three questionnaires answered by the "potential influentials" were tabulated to determine four lists of persons

and groups from each school in rank order. The rank orders were determined by weighting perceived ranked responses on each returned questionnaire. A perceived first ranking resulted in a weight of ten points; a second received nine points; a third received eight points, etc. This continued to a perceived tenth ranking which was given one point, in the weighting system. The results of the questionnaire responses were converted into lists of "key influential" and "lesser influential" individuals and groups for each school.

For the fourth major data gathering step, the investigator observed the formal organizational charts and other information in each school to determine who the formal occupants of influential positions were. The levels of the persons holding official positions on the charts were converted into ranked lists which identify these persons.

Each perceived individual "influential" who was identified in the two schools was interviewed in depth concerning specifically identified issues (see Appendix E) for step number five. These "influentials" included all of the persons on the "key influential" lists plus several on the "lesser influential" list of individuals in each school. The break-off point on the "lesser influential" list was made at a natural clustering or break-off point that was selected on the basis of the previously described weighting system.

The interview schedule (Appendix E) contains fourteen questions that were designed to elicit many types of data that relate to the development of each of the three specific issues selected for study in each school. The specific issues at both Central High and East High fit into three general issue areas.

The data from the interviews were used to write descriptions of the nature of each issue in both schools including the decision-making process

related to each issue. Comparisons of similar issue areas were also made. The descriptions, interview data, and questionnaire data were applied to each of the five study questions to reach the generalizations and conclusions for the study.

Background

Observed similarities between the schools include student enrollment, number of faculty and staff, conventional curriculum, student activities, size of one-story buildings, "community responsibility," and cooperation with civic groups. A delegation of a major portion of decision-making authority and day-to-day operations of each school is delegated to the principal by the school district superintendent. His support for each principal, regardless of the individual style of operation and administration, is apparent.

Differences include Central as the oldest, relatively more tradition bound high school in the district, compared with East which is only a few years old. Central is near the district administration building and the downtown business area while East is several miles removed. Potential communication on a school wide basis is better at older Central High, but the communication within departments is potentially much better at East.

Perhaps the greatest difference is in the "climate" established by the respective principals. At Central High, the present school principal apparently makes specific and frequent efforts to include many of the school's faculty members in the making of decisions. Some persons have described the situation as a "team effort" or as "democratic administration." At East High, most decision-making authority is retained by the present school principal. He is often described as "on top of everything," and he delegates very little responsibility to anyone except to his two vice-

principals in some select areas.

Treatment of the reputational data included analysis of individuals and groups under seventeen resulting categories. Space does not permit a breakdown and presentation of these data which were previously mentioned in the data collection section of this paper.

The issue analysis data, also originally analyzed separately, serve to balance the reputational data. The combined approaches serve as a check upon and validation of the analysis determined by each methodology.

From the issue analysis findings a complete case study was written for each of the selected issues. Treatment of these data also yielded four more categories of influence by individuals and groups for the schools. Again, space does not allow these presentations.

Generalizations

By combining the nominations and reputations generalizations with the issue analysis generalizations we get two lists of final generalizations regarding operational decision-making in the schools. First, are the generalizations which are supported by data from both of the approaches. Second, are the generalizations which are supported by one approach, but not by the other.

The generalizations which are supported by both the nominations and the issue analysis data are:

1. Despite the type of decision-making climate that is established by the formal leader (the principal), most influence or perceived influence will remain in the hands of relatively few persons or groups.

2. The prevailing decision-making climate (relatively open or relatively closed) provided by the principal in a school can accordingly increase or decrease the number of influentials or perceived influentials.

3. A relatively closed decision-making climate in schools greatly reduces individual and group participation or perceived influence in most decisions. Groups which are unorganized have an especially difficult time in exerting influence or in being perceived as influential.

4. Proximity to the top decision-maker (the principal), in terms of official position or in terms of physical base of operations, is often a very important influence factor, or perceived influence factor, for individuals.

5. Student groups have little general influence or perceived influence, in the operation of schools.

6. The superintendent may sometimes delegate major operational decision authority to others such as assistant superintendents or principals.

7. A form of elitism (as compared to pluralism) prevails in the schools. However, a relatively open decision-making climate serves to reduce the elitism somewhat. A relatively closed decision-making climate reinforces elitism and suppresses many persons and groups that might otherwise influence decisions for the organizations.

The generalizations which are supported by data from only one of the two approaches are:

1. The principal will always be the top influential in his school unless a superintendent or an assistant superintendent consistently takes special measures to control the school, or unless the principal makes a special effort to delegate much of his authority to someone else such as a vice-principal.

2. Top building administrators sometimes exercise implied delegation of authority from top district administrators in major operational decisions.

3. Top administrators have a two-way vantage point which greatly contributes to their total perceived influence. They are readily seen by others in the organization, as well as by persons outside the organization, and they have an opportunity to see and work with many people in many operational areas. This also applies to holders of relatively "lesser" official positions.

4. In almost all cases, individuals "outside" the top administrative positions must channel their actions and efforts through these administrators in order to be successful in influencing decisions in any area.

5. Consistent aggressiveness and retention of operational decisions at the top (by the principal or superintendent or by groups of top administrators) will markedly reduce influence or perception of influence.

6. An established informal communication network between perceived "key influentials" is maintained in schools. This network is difficult for an "outsider" to break into on a consistent basis.

7. Only persons who are present in the day-to-day operation of schools possess potential to be perceived as general "key influentials."

8. Board members, students, parents, community power structure members, professors, educators in other districts, state department of education personnel, "outside" experts, etc., are not close enough to the continuous operation of schools to become important general "key influentials."

9. Final decisions on all operational decisions are likely to be made inside the district, if not inside the school, by top administrators.

10. Groups that contain top individual influentials, or have consistent communication with them, will possess markedly more influence than other similar groups without this type of advantage.

11. In almost all cases, individuals or groups "outside" the top administrative positions must channel their actions and efforts through these administrators in order to be successful in influencing decisions.

12. Persons who are "lesser influentials" (generally) usually maintain their influence by continued interaction with one or more persons who are in the top influence category for the organization.

13. Assertiveness or aggressiveness by an individual or a group is apparently a very important factor in exerting successful influence on school decisions in any type of decision-making climate.

14. Professional competence of persons in school organizations seems to play some role, but it appears less important in terms of general decision-making influence than is generally believed.

15. Despite other strong qualities, teachers without an added official position, such as department head, counselor, consultant, etc., are severely handicapped in being perceived as "key influentials."

16. District staff officers who are specialists e.g. guidance, social studies, transportation, mathematics, etc. can be influential in decisions which fall in their area of expertise if schools have a relatively open decision-making climate.

17. Individuals such as department heads, principals from other schools in the district, counselors, "outside" educational experts, community members from downtown, etc., may exert some influence in specific decisions in a relatively open decision-making climate.

18. Individuals such as teachers, counselors, department heads, classified personnel, persons "outside" the district, persons "outside" the profession, etc., do not exert broad general influence in decisions for schools. The influence of such people is even less in schools with a relatively closed decision-making climate.

19. Individual influence in the "internal matters" of schools can be maintained by an administrator after he transfers to an administrative position elsewhere in the district.

20. With the exception of previous screening of women away from top administrative positions, there is little perceived influence due to sex differences.

21. The distinction between line and staff authority is not clearly defined in the minds of many persons in schools and elsewhere in the district.

22. Persons such as teachers, "outside" educators, community members, etc., acting without the sponsorship of select organizations or groups, are usually not influential in operational decisions.

23. Some groups and individuals possess perceived influence largely because of their potential rather than their exercised influence.

24. The amount of perceived influence possessed by a group sometimes follows the amount of perceived individual influence of its key members.

25. Collective group action or organizational sponsorship of a spokesman can result in influence that their members could not achieve alone in decisions for schools with a relatively open decision-making climate.

26. Groups that are very far removed from the daily operation of schools were not perceived as generally highly influential, no matter how much power they hold in the larger social system (the community).

27. Influence of groups "outside" the profession in the school district is not always of an active type. Influence can be passive when the wishes of the group (usually negative) are anticipated by the top decision-makers in some specific decision areas.

28. Organizations with inherent power, such as the school board and federal government funding agencies, can occasionally exercise influence in specific decisions. Regulatory funding agencies such as the state department of education are also influential on occasion.

29. Federal government funding agencies are becoming increasingly influential in specific decisions for schools.

30. The amount of perceived influence possessed by "downtown" groups on school matters may often be over-rated by educators and by non-educators.

Conclusions

For the final conclusions of the study, each of the five major research questions will be considered and answered by utilizing all relevant data and generalizations previously gathered for the project.

Question 1. Under what circumstances do reputations for power and influence correspond to formal organizational position? On the basis of the research data, it appears that under the following circumstances, reputations for power and influence will correspond to formal organizational positions when the district line offices are considered high organizational positions.

Persons holding formal organizational positions must be visibly active, in some manner, in the exercise of power and influence. They must work directly with, or in view of, other persons who create reputations for power and influence.

In some cases, if persons who create these reputations are aware of the major decision-making aspects of the job description of the holder, they tend to recognize power and influence if they feel the incumbent is fulfilling his job. This may occur when decision-making power and influence are retained by the holders of "top" organizational positions, as is the

case at East High School, or when some decision-making power and influence are delegated and diffused, as is the case at Central High School.

Reputations for power and influence also remain consistent with formal organizational position when persons holding "lower" positions seldom or never attempt to exert overt influence in the organization. This also holds true when avenues of overt influence are shut off or denied to those holding "lower" organizational positions.

Question 2. How are power and influence in decision-making modified or affected by persons in the school who do not hold formal organizational status or positions? The data indicate that this modification of power and influence in decisions by those in the school holding "lesser" positions is a matter of varying degrees. The varying degrees of successful influence have been achieved by several basic means.

Persons who do not hold "high" formal organizational positions may work through those who do hold this status. This may be accomplished through personal influence, by a position of mutual agreement, or by some other direct means.

The utilization of pressure, shock action, or force is occasionally successful, usually on an ad hoc or limited basis, in exerting influence on organizational decisions. On a more consistent basis, possession of "a loud voice," "strong will," "lack of fear," "seniority," or some similar base of influence has worked for a limited number of persons in the schools that were studied.

An even lesser number of classroom teachers have built a reputation for some power and influence, which often increase actual influence or decisions, when they have gained support from groups of teachers or persons outside the organization. This fact obviously attracts the attention of a

"higher" position holder to a viewpoint or "cause" being espoused by the "lower" position holder. However, tactics like this have also resulted in failure by generating increasing resistance in the higher echelons of the organization.

Very often, if not most often, persons of lower organizational "rank" have affected decisions by exercising consent or delegation of influence by holders of higher formal "rank" in the organization. This was especially in evidence among Central High School faculty members as well as among the principals of both schools and their assistants.

Question 3. Under what circumstances will persons without formal positions of authority in the schools exercise influence in the making of decisions? The answers to this question are very closely related to the previous study question. The circumstances under which decisions are influenced by persons with relatively little or no positions of organizational authority are perhaps best explained as follows:

1. Under circumstances which permit these persons to work through those who do hold formal organizational positions of relatively high authority.

2. Under circumstances which enable these persons to utilize pressure, shock action, or force on an ad hoc basis or when a more persistent base of forceful influence is built up for repeated application.

3. Under circumstances which enable these persons to build a general reputation for power and influence or when they have been able to gain a following of other persons inside or outside the organization.

4. Under the most frequent circumstances where these persons have been able to exercise consent or delegation of influence from "higher" formal position holders.

Question 4. How will extra-organizational power and influence be manifested? Upon close examination of the study data, the manifestation of power and influence from outside the formal organization appeared in many forms. Once again the degrees of success were varied.

Direct action or confrontation of formal organizational office holders was a prevalent manifestation of extra-organizational influence. A group of community professional men who voiced their displeasure regarding originally planned services of a guidance clinic provides a ready example. However, there are decisions that are not modified by direct pressure of this type. Demands and requests that are perceived as unreasonable or excessive by individuals and groups have been rejected by administrators and school board members. "Ultra-conservative" letters to editors in newspapers have been ignored as well as demands voiced by groups such as the local taxpayers' league.

Personal influence with administrators and other formal position holders has appeared in the form of requests, suggestions, endorsements and rejections of plans, etc. In some instances, this could be readily observed, but much of this type of influence is difficult if not impossible to trace or assess. Persons belonging to the "downtown power structure," friends of administrators, and other citizens with open channels of communication to administrators, board members, and other formal position holders appeared to have actual and potential influence in some organizational affairs.

Persons or media with the means of reaching large numbers of people with respect to school issues were potentially influential in both schools. A local newspaper editor is perhaps the most potentially influential example for the school district which was studied.

Influence from authorative sources is difficult to pinpoint. Professional literature contributed by outside experts relating to flexible scheduling sparked an issue in that area at Central High. University schools of education, their professors, educators from other districts, state department of education personnel, etc., are still more examples. Another similar example of influence is a person who is called in as a consultant or asked for advice on a particular matter. For example, the state commissioner of education played a role in a Central High School scheduling issue.

There are numerous cases in which persons or agencies influence decisions and issues in schools without intending to have any effect at all. An outside agency funded by the federal government which hired away two assistant superintendents and a local clinical psychologist who gave a talk heard by administrators and faculty members in the district are examples of this type.

Agencies that plan to effect changes in schools are becoming more prevalent across the nation at the present time. The grant from the federal government, which in turn created a guidance clinic on the Central High School grounds is a concrete example.

Many other subtle influences from individuals, groups, and agencies also probably play some role in decision-making at Central and East High Schools. However, it is difficult to assess any influences beyond those that have appeared in this study.

Question 5. Is there a consistency between personal reputation for power and perceived exercise of power and influence concerning decisions? An overall consistency was noted at both Central and East High among the "key influentials" in this respect. Most of the few exceptions in the combined reputational and issue analysis findings can be logically explained and subsequently dis-regarded.

APPENDIX A

You will not be identified by name at any time to anyone, nor will your school or district be identified in the final results of this study. Your response will aid in increased knowledge of another part of the educational profession.

In all schools there are decisions made as a result of issues, problems, or projects which are essential to the operation of the schools. After very careful consideration, will you please identify five major issues, problems, changes, or innovations resulting in a decision that you felt were of greatest school-wide importance in your school since the start of the 1963-64 year?

THANK YOU VERY MUCH

ISSUE	PLEASE EXPLAIN IN SOME DETAIL
1.	
2.	
3.	
4.	
5.	

APPENDIX B

Name_____

School or building_____

Teaching or administrative assignment_____

Department(s)_____

Length of service in your present school_____

Organizations or groups inside the school to which you belong_____

_____

Organizations outside the school to which you belong_____

_____

In every school some individuals have more influence in decision-making than others. The following questions are to find out who you think are the most important leaders in your school district or community with respect to school decisions. Please avoid the automatic responses as to position or "who should," but indicate the actual persons involved regardless of position. "Who does" is the requested response.

You will never be identified by name in the results of this study, nor will the name of your school or district. Your objective response will aid in the possible improvement of the process of education.

THANK YOU VERY MUCH

Please rank, in order, the key leaders whom you consider to be generally the most influential in decisions about this school (these may be persons that function inside the school or outside the school in any capacity).

	Name	Position	Why They Are Influential
1st			
2nd			
3rd			
4th			
5th			
6th			
7th			
8th			
9th			
10th			

APPENDIX C

Name_____

School or building_____

Teaching or administrative assignment_____

Department(s)_____

Length of service in your present school_____

Organizations or groups inside the school to which you belong_____

_____

Organizations outside the school to which you belong_____

_____

In every school, some groups or organizations have more influence in decision-making than others. The following questions are to find out which you think are the most important groups or organizations in your school district or community with respect to school decisions. Please avoid the automatic responses as "which group should" but indicate the actual groups or organizations involved regardless of position. "Which group does" is the requested response.

You will never be identified by name in the results of this study, nor will the name of your school or district. Your objective response will aid in the possible improvement of the process of education.

THANK YOU VERY MUCH

Please rank, in order, the key groups or organizations, formal or informal, which you consider to be generally the most influential in decisions about this school (these may be groups that function inside the school or outside the school in any capacity).

	Groups or Organizations	Why They Are Influential
1st		
2nd		
3rd		
4th		
5th		
6th		
7th		
8th		
9th		
10th		

APPENDIX D

We would now like to focus on influence in specific decision areas. How would key leaders and groups or organizations rank in the following areas?

I. (name of issue filled in) _____

	Name of Individuals	Groups or Organizations
1st		
2nd		
3rd		
4th		
5th		
6th		
7th		
8th		
9th		
10th		

II. (name of issue filled in) _____

	Name of Individuals	Groups or Organizations
1st		
2nd		
3rd		
4th		
5th		
6th		
7th		
8th		
9th		
10th		

III. (name of issue filled in) _____

	Name of Individuals	Groups or Organizations
1st		
2nd		
3rd		
4th		
5th		
6th		
7th		
8th		
9th		
10th		

APPENDIX E

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

In this research project, we are interested in studying how schools go about dealing with their issues. We have selected three specific issues for detailed study. The three we have selected are:_____

_____

I would like to discuss the decision in detail, giving particular attention to its historical development. I would like to ask you some questions of this nature. You will never be identified by name at any point in the study.

1. When and how did the issue get started?

2. What were the <u>different</u> solutions that were proposed?

3. Who made these solutions? (Persons from the school, district, community, or elsewhere.) What were the circumstances surrounding the solutions?

4. Did persons, organizations, or agencies outside the school have some influence on the issue? If so, will you please name them. How did they try to make their influence felt? Why did they succeed?

5. Which individuals, groups, departments, or organizations got together to support each solution?

6. Why did each of these individuals, groups, departments, or organizations become involved? (Philosophies and interests)

7. At what <u>point</u> did particular individuals, departments, or organizations become active?

8. What did the individuals, groups, departments, or organizations <u>do</u> to try to get their solutions accepted? (What roles did they play in regard to the other solutions?)

9. What effect did these individuals, groups, departments, or organizations have on the course that the issue took?

10. What happened to the various solutions? (Final result)

11. What were the big events, occasions, or turning points that had a major effect on the final outcome?

12. Were there any rules, policies, agencies, laws or legal requirements that affected the alternatives?

13. Were you personally involved in this issue? If so, with which individuals, groups, departments, or organizations did you work? What role did you play? Why? What position did you take?

14. What is the <u>current status</u> of the issue?